INDEX
MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
18 September 1963

Page

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

   a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design 1-2

   b. Bureau of Printing and Engraving-Alterations to Building 2

2. District of Columbia Government

   a. Department of Licenses and Inspections

      (1) Watergate Development at Virginia Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue and Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway 3

      (2) S.L. 64-37, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W., Revised Design for Apartment House 3-4

      (3) O.G. 64-4, 3037 K St., Razing Application 4

   b. Department of Buildings and Grounds-Smithsonian Institution

      National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace-Proposed Design 4-5

   c. Department of Highways and Traffic

      Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, Sculpture-Status 5-6

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
18 September 1963

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., with William Walton, Chairman, Presiding.

Present were: Members - William Walton, Chairman
David E. Finley
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: L.R. Wilson, Secretary
C.H.Atherton, Asst. Sec'y
C.L. Martin, Counsel
Myra Younker, Editor

Recorder - Leone M. Vialpando

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS_INTERVIEWS

1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design

Mr. Robert T. Daly, Commissioner, Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Design Division, Public Buildings Service, Mr. Nathaniel C. Curtis, Jr., architect of Curtis and Davis, Associates, Mr. Bernard J. Grad, architect of Frank Grad & Sons, Mr. A. Grant Fordyce and Mr. David R. Dibner, architects of Fordyce and Hamby, met with the Commission to discuss a revised design for the building.

Mr. Daly made a brief statement in which he said that the General Services Administration had agreed with the Commission's view, after reviewing the initial design on 17 April 1963, that the treatment of the facade of the building was unsuitable to the location and that he believed the revised design had accomplished everything the Commission had recommended.

Mr. Curtis then outlined the architects' appraisal of the design and reviewed the changes to the original proposal. The principal change was the addition of exposed masonry piers spaced at regular intervals along the facade of the building extending 8 feet above the cornice line. Between these piers flat glass would be used instead of the faceted glass originally proposed. The massing of the 1,780,000 square foot building would remain unchanged.

In the general discussion which followed the members stated their

views on the design. It was generally agreed that the primary objection to the design was the belief that the mass and length of the tower building along Independence Avenue would visually seal off the Tenth Street Mall and L'Enfant Plaza from the rest of the city thus destroying the original conception of the Mall as a gateway to the Southwest urban renewal area. They were also of the opinion that the introduction of exterior piers did not relieve the monotony of extensive areas of glass and moreover that the piers projecting above the cornice would create a distracting element to the profile of the building.

Following the discussion with the architects, the members suggested that the architects be requested to study ways to break up the mass of the tower building by means of introduction of an accent where the building spans 10th Street and to provide a greater use of masonry.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter to the Administrator of General Services Administration reaffirming the previous Commission's objections to the design and asking for new studies. EXHIBIT A

b. Bureau of Printing and Engraving - Alterations to Building

Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Public Buildings Service, and Mr. Don Martell, architect of Perkins and Will, requested the Commission's views on a proposal to locate an airconditioning tower in a courtyard of the building and to replace the existing window sash with a fiberous plastic material bonded to aluminum.

The members pointed out that the building occupied a prominent location on 14th Street and was seen by many visitors entering the City. They thought that if new windows must be installed it was important that the effect produced would be an improvement to the appearance of the building. They were of the opinion that the grayish plastic material might give the building a blank and factory-like appearance. It was suggested that the entire fenestration of the building be carefully studied and that different window materials could be used in different parts of the building. It was also suggested that mockups be prepared and installed in windows in the building for study.

The Commission had no objection to the design and location of the cooling tower.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the views of the Commission. EXHIBIT B

2. District of Columbia Government

a. Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Watergate Development at Virginia Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue and Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway

Professor Luigi Moretti, architect, and representatives of Island Vista, Inc., developers of the Watergate Project, met with the Commission to discuss the development plan.

Professor Moretti explained the basic concepts which led to the development of the project. The members were then shown a number of scale models and drawings illustrating various details of the proposed design for the project.

Following Professor Moretti's presentation the members met in executive session to consider the nature of the Commission's report to the District Government. The members agreed that the Commission could not approve the project as presented because of the height of the buildings along the river front, which was excessive and would destroy the character of the adjoining parkland. They were of the opinion that changes made to the design following the agreement between the architects of the Commission and the Island Vista, Inc. in May, 1962 had not met the intent of the Commission's agreement with the developers that a substantial reduction should be made in the height of the buildings along the waterfront. Accordingly, it was concluded that the Commission should recommend that the height of the buildings closest to the public park lands should not exceed a height of 90 feet above the ground.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the recommendations of the Commission. EXHIBIT C

(2) S.L. 64-37, 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W., Revised Design for Apartment House

Mr. J.B. Shapiro, Mr. Maurice Shapiro, builders, Mr. William Shoemaker, architect, and Mr. J.P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits, met with the Commission to discuss a revised design for the apartment building. The revisions were an attempt to comply with the Commission's recommendation, made at the meeting on 18 June 1963, that the architect study the possibility of stepping back portions of the building facing the Zoo.

Mr. Shapiro and Mr. Shoemaker explained that in the revised design three setbacks of 6 feet each were proposed on each wing facing the Zoo. In this arrangement the number of apartments would be reduced from 1495 to 1232, and 30 garage spaces would be eliminated. Mr. Shapiro stated that this reduction represented the maximum amount that he could economically reduce the size of the building.

In executive session the members agreed that they should recommend that the application for a building permit not be granted because the

overwhelming mass of the building would adversely affect the public land it faces.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the recommendations of the Commission. EXHIBIT D

(3) O.G. 64-4, 3037 K Street, Razing Application - Status

Mr. J. P. Green, Assistant Superintendent of Licenses and Permits, reported to the members that he had spoken with the owner of the property concerning the Commission's recommendation to try and save the old building by reconditioning it or moving it, and as a result he believed there was no possibility of convincing the owner that the structure should be saved. As evidence of this he showed a copy of a letter from the real estate agent of the owner, requesting that the permit to raze the building be issued.

The members concluded that under the circumstances the Commission should not continue to oppose the granting of a razing permit. EXHIBIT E

b. Department of Buildings and Grounds - Smithsonian Institution

National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Proposed Design

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary, Mr. James Bradley, Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Dr. T. H. Reed, Director, National Zoological Park, Mr. G. A. Purcell, Liaison Representative, D. C. Department of Buildings and Grounds, and Mr. Richard Dimon, architect of Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall, consulting architects, met with the Commission to discuss a proposed design for a new Connecticut Avenue pedestrian entrance to the Zoo, and other features related to the exhibition areas in Phase II of the development plan for the Zoo.

Dr. Carmichael made a few introductory remarks regarding the history of the Zoological Park and the factors which have made it necessary to undertake a program of capital improvements.

Mr. Bradley then explained that the objectives of the ten year master plan were to remove arterial traffic from the center of the Zoo, provide new and improved parking facilities, provide an internal transportation system, to replace worn-out and inadequate exhibition buildings, and to replace iron bars and cages with the habitat type of exhibit employing necessary safety devices such as wet moats, dry moats, structural glass, etc.

Mr. Dimon, using drawings and a scale model, explained the rationale and function of the various features of the plan. It was pointed out that the change from the master plan in location of the plaza from a location near Connecticut Avenue to a distance 400 feet east of the Avenue was

made because of a ridge which parallels the Avenue. In order to shape the contour of this land to accomodate the three winding paths and the plaza it would be necessary to remove most of the trees flanking the entrance to the Zoo. The old trees would be placed with smaller species such as flowering dogwood and redbud.

The Chairman and other members voiced the objection that the proposed plan would materially alter the character of the Zoo by extensive grading, removal of old trees, and the imposition of great emphasis on structural elements. They pointed out, for example, that although it was necessary to provide flat areas for the display of hoofed stock, the changes in topography near Connecticut Avenue had no relation to upgrading the nearby exhibition area but were dictated solely by the location and design of the proposed pedestrian pathways and visitors' reception center.

Mr. Sasaki gave an analysis of the entire plan in which he pointed out several aspects of the design which he believed were defective and should be restudied. His remarks are exhibit F[1].

In executive session the members agreed that they could not approve the plan presented and that the Commission's report should stress the fact that the plan constituted an undesirable major departure from the concepts of the Master Plan. It was concluded that the Commission should request a restudy of the design to reduce the impact of new structural elements and to merge them into the landscape and to preserve the existing trees to the greatest extent possible.

The Chairman was authorized to send a letter setting forth the recommendations of the Commission. EXHIBIT F[2]

c. Department of Highways and Traffic

Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, Sculpture - Status

The Chairman reported that he had received a letter from Mr. Harold Aitken, Director of the Department of Highways and Traffic, regarding the design of four sculptural figures by Laura Gardin Fraser to be carved in the abutments of the bridge where it passes over the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. In his letter Mr. Aitken explained that the stone on which the figures would be carved in relief was in place but that he wished to meet with the Commission prior to the time the contract to execute the design was signed. Photographs of plaster models of the four symbolic figures were shown to the members. The designs for the figures had been approved by the Theodore Roosevelt Association, the National Park Service, and the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Chairman stated that no action was necessary at the present time as he did not know what Mr. Aitken would propose be done, but suspected

that he would propose eliminating the sculpture altogether.

No action was taken pending receipt of more information from Mr. Aitken.

Thereupon, at 3:30 p.m., the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin

C. L. Martin
Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
18 September 1963

AM
9:30 I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

9:35 1. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. Federal Office Building No. 5 - Revised Design
(Mr. Karel H. Yasko, Assistant Commissioner of Design and Construction, Public Bldgs Svc; Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Design Division, Public Bldgs Svc; Mr. Nathaniel C. Curtis, Jr., of Curtis & Davis, Associates; Mr. Bernard J. Grad, of Frank Grad & Sons; Mr. A. Grant Fordyce, of Fordyce & Hamby, Associates; Mr. David R. Dibner, of Fordyce & Hamby, Associates)

b. Bureau of Printing and Engraving - Alterations to Building
(Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Design Division, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration)

10:30 2. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses & Inspections

Watergate Development at Virginia Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue, and Potomac Parkway, Northwest
(Professor Luigi Moretti, architect; Messrs. Royce F. Ward, Giuseppe Cecchi, H. Newman Clark, Nicholas Salgo of Island Vista, Inc.)

11:30 3. Smithsonian Institution

National Zoological Park, Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace - Proposed Design
(Mr. James Bradley, Assistant Secretary, Smithsonian Inst.; Dr. T. H. Reed, Director, National Zoological Park; Mr. Richard Dimon, architect; Mr. G.A.Purcell, D.C. Department of Buildings and Grounds)

ADJOURN

12:15 4. D.C.Department of Licenses and Inspections

S.L.68-37, Apartment House, 2700 Adams Mill Road-Proposed Design
(Mr. William Shoemaker, Architect; Mr. J.B.Shapiro, Builder; Mr. J.P. Green, Asst. Superintendent of Licenses and Permits)

27 September 1963

Dear Mr. Boutin:

I am writing in regard to a revised design for Federal Office Building No. 5 which was reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on 16 September.

The presentation by the architects was based largely on material shown to the Commission at its April meeting, the principal difference being limited to the treatment of elevations of the long mass paralleling Independence Avenue. The revised design proposed that a series of exposed masonry piers would be incorporated at intervals in what was formerly an all glass facade. As you know, the Commission strongly objected to the extensive areas of glass at that time, because the members felt it would disrupt the continuity of the other buildings along the Mall.

This same criticism applies to the revised design. The Commission believes that the piers and resulting bays do little to offset the effect of the glass, and to some degree further detract by projecting above the cornice into the skyline.

The Commission also objects to the unbroken 800 foot length of the slab-like mass along Independence Avenue, especially in relation to the entrance to 10th Street and the Mall to the Southwest Plaza beyond. Without any interruption to the building at this point, the members believe that the whole purpose of creating this entrance will be lost, not only to the detriment of the building itself, but to the Plaza areas on both the north and south sides.

The Commission would therefore like to see new studies of this element which should stress the following: (1) a treatment of the Independence Avenue facade which would relieve the monotonous effect of its length, (2) the introduction of a strong accent where the mass spans 10th Street, and (3) more emphasis on the use of solid

EXHIBIT A

elements on the facade, with a reduction in the total glass area.

The Commission will hold its next meeting on October 15 and 16, and would like to see as many of the studies as the architects may have ready at that time. They believe it would be helpful as well as save time if the studies were presented in simple sketch form rather than as finished renderings, etc.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Bernard Boutin
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

27 September 1963

Dear Mr. Boutin:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on September 18, considered the proposed alterations to the Bureau of Printing and Engraving building located at 14th and C Streets, S.W. The alterations would include the addition of an exterior cooling tower and the replacement of existing window sash with translucent plastic panels.

The Commission approved the proposed location and design of the cooling tower, but had strong reservations about the new window panels, and the effect they would have on the appearance of the building. The existing sash are already factory-like in character, and the grey plastic panels would most likely tend to further this aspect. Ideally the new sash should be redesigned to bring them more into harmony with the building. Before making new studies along this approach, however, the Commission believes it would be reasonable to construct a mock-up of the plastic panels so that at least an accurate appraisal can be made of their effect on the building. This mock-up should be sufficiently large and located in an area where it will be exposed to direct sunlight.

The members of the Commission will be glad to inspect window samples whenever they are ready. Our next meetings are scheduled for 16 October, 20 November, and 18 December.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Honorable Bernard Boutin
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

23 September 1965

Dear Mr. Green:

I am writing in regard to the proposed Watergate project which the Commission considered at its meeting on September 16. While no formal action was requested of the Commission, the members wish to make a clear statement of their views.

It is their belief that previous objections of the Commission to the building heights have not been met. On several prior occasions it has been recommended that a substantial reduction in height be made, but the designs that have been developed by the architect show no essential change over earlier versions. Of the five major structures proposed on the site only a small portion of the roof of one building is less than 120 feet above ground. The remainder are all over this level, with the two buildings closest to Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway nearly 160 feet over the level of the road. It is this area that is of particular concern to the Commission because the Shipstead-Luce Act, enacted by Congress in 1930, specifically mentions Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway and requires the Commission of Fine Arts to regulate all construction abutting this area, particularly with regard to building heights.

It is the Commission's belief that this segment of the National Park System would be seriously impaired by the proposed building heights, all of which are in excess of similar types of construction in other areas of the city. Accordingly the Commission recommends a substantial reduction in the number of stories, especially of the two buildings closest to public park lands. The Commission believes that these two buildings should not exceed the height of 90 feet above the ground.

The Commission thought that Mr. Moretti's design was a fresh and imaginative approach to use of the river site and that if it were developed on a less massive scale might be an attractive addition to the city's architecture.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled to be held on

EXHIBIT C

October 16, and we would be glad to review any further studies you may have developed by that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of
Licenses and Permits
District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

23 September 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

I am writing to report that the Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on September 18, disapproved the design for an apartment building proposed at 2700 Adams Mill Road, N.W.

Following the presentation of Mr. J. B. Shapiro and Mr. William Shoemaker, respectively builder and architect, the members of the Commission concluded that the massive appearance of the proposed buildings would seriously impinge on the National Zoological Gardens and Rock Creek Park, both of which adjoin the site on the north and west. The perimeter of the building at these critical locations is over 800 feet in length and presents an unbroken mass which varies from 10 to 15 stories in height along the entire south boundary of the Zoo.

It is therefore recommended that a complete restudy of the site plan be made, stressing smaller scale components arranged in a more open manner.

We will be glad to consider any new studies at the next meeting of the Commission which will be held on October 16.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent of Licenses
and Permits
District Building
Washington 4, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

Read to B. Walton
27 Sept 63. Grd Prod.

September 26, 1963

Dear Mr. Green:

The Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on September 18th gave further consideration to the proposed razing of a dwelling at 3037 "K" Street, N. W.

The Commission regrets that the owner of the property has found no way to use the building in its existing location and considers it unfeasible to relocate the building elsewhere under more desirable circumstances. On the other hand, the members of the Commission agree that the proximity of the Whitehurst Freeway and adjoining industrial buildings are blighting factors on the property and believe that it would be unreasonable to recommend further that the building be retained.

It should be noted that the Commission of Fine Arts, having made an effort to preserve this structure, considers this action to be within the intent of Public Law 808, 81st Congress, and that it does not constitute a precedent for future applications to raze other buildings of the Federal period.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington 4, D. C.
cc Chief, Permit Branch

EXHIBIT E

area is where there is no exhibition whatsoever; it is a purely arbitrary sudden landscape garden approach to a park that will not improve your viewing of animals in the slightest. It just looks like a nursery man was setting out azaleas and dogwoods when what is there is irreplaceable, unpurchasable, a great legacy.

I just think it would be scandalous to cut down that entire grove of trees. I'm not supposed to express such opinions, I suppose, but this is my strong opinion.

DR. CARMICHAEL: I must say, as I listen to it, it is most convincing.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am like Conrad Wirth. I weep for trees.

MR. WARNECKE: Mr. Chairman, because this is just the beginning of a long series of things, would it not be terribly helpful if you could state your overall philosophy, philosophy of landscape design, philosophy of structure, what type of structure--simple--forgetting the technical requirements which we understand and all know you are trying to achieve? But if you would, we could guide you a little better.

I think we're way off on philosophy. This Commission does not agree with this approach.

MR. SASAKI: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes, Mr. Sasaki?

MR. SASAKI: Perhaps it may be helpful to the designer,

as well as the others, to take up specific details then of the plan.

If you go from the entrance place--the reason why we lose so many trees here is not because we want an entrance here, because we already have an entrance. I agree with you now that we have a vehicular entrance, this ought to be redesigned to become a pedestrian entrance. But by selecting this precise type of design, you have created an area of effect which starts from here (indicaintg) but it goes on in effect up to there (indicating), thereby necessitating the regrading of the entire area and losing all the trees. Also, in detail, the design criticism here is that by placing three, say, paths to select from, you are confronted immediately with confusion, so it doesn't lead, really, to good design because you have three alternate choices. You are hard put to decide which you should really go on.

You mention this is the principal one (indicating), but I think it would be better if you did not build a house with three doors to select from, so I think this can be redesigned here in detail and still keep it in the general intention of having a design here and differentiated also with the--

Now entrances exist throughout the zoo in different scales. This of course is the principal symbolic one, so it should be, I think, the one that is most easily recognizable.

But as you go down this perimeter road, you have other entrances like here and there (indicating). The junction of the autos to the pedestrian, especially now in this perimeter road--and I think it is very urgent that you restudy those areas, so they become receptive to the auto at those points, because you'll have people cutting all over there.

Now in terms of entrances it is only one factor of a total process of circulating through the area. If you look at the master plan, there, essentially--or I should say basically--it's a continuous loop around which there are many exhibits and minor paths taking off from it.

Now the major path, then, should be very clear so that the users will not be misled and you work in relating this, as you mention, with the uses that are put on it.

However, as you look at the total area you have a sort of swell running through the middle here (indicating). You have one path going around this way (indicating), the other going to your great flight cage this way (indicating), which means you are a ridge-runner, so to speak, hugging the edge here.

Now by plunging down here with this rail thing plus a walkway here (indicating) I think again you create a sense of confusion because you have a bewildering number of choices. While this is the main one in a sense, I think this would be so dramatic--once you are headed down in that

direction and then suddenly discover that was not the principal way at all, that you wanted to either get to the great flight cage or animal viewing terrace, then there is no way of getting from the lower circulation area to the upper circulation area, so I don't see the need, really, for this one here (indicating).

I was not quite clear on how the service and the rail circulation went, but maybe you have already thought of this in some detail.

So I think the thing there to watch, though, is that they do not cross excessively.

MR. DIMON: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: May I just continue? Now, once you come over into this area, I think this is true, this will give you a rather strategic overlook and in many ways I am intrigued by the idea, and I think it will be an improvement, even though I have to disagree with Mr. Kelly here. To some degree, the activity that takes place up here (indicating) up to the main park, start of displays is a little too loose right now. You have to walk a distance until you come to the center. But you have to recognize you have one sort of area here related to the visitors center and all of this, and once you come over here (indicating), the scale of the thing is so enormous-- I have forgotten the length of the viewing terrace--

MR. DIMON: 500 feet.

MR. SASAKI: How wide is it here (indicating)?

MR. DIMON: 75 feet.

MR. SASAKI: In complete exposure to Washington sun. Since summer is the great tourist season, I doubt that that terrace will be a very pleasant way in which to view animals. The other thing, too, is architecturally I mean, since you have a fall here and a grade of some eight feet (indicating) then of necessity you have to slope a roof which makes for a peculiar situation, I think, architecturally, looking from the other side.

Here where you have this moat, I think, it is very good. Then you should not really have planting there in front of the moat. I think it would be more fun to come directly to an edge of water. You tend to find the edge of lakes and so forth, the most worn. There's always a path there, so I am afraid you will have all this trampled in some way.

The other thing is because you're required to have certain sorts of forms within this entire park, I am a little concerned about the different character and different quality of design such as this entrance detail, the juxtaposition of really a very strong circular form with a rather free form; and active water and still water, such an enormous length with a rather small terminus, so again I think the matter of form relationship is important.

If you will look at the general alignment of paths, you have to either make it all fluid, curvilinear, or a series

of arc and tangents, but if you have an arc and tangent and other curves, I think you will run into certain peculiarities as to how this joins in the form of the land, so I think aside from the matter of program and functional requirements, I think there is a lot of criticism from the standpoint of the design plan.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think that is a very helpful statement and a very expert one. We all recognize that the Commission has a problem in that we have another customer who is even later than you were.

If the Commissioners have any quick questions to ask, I would entertain them. I want to assure Dr. Carmichael that we share his ambition for the very handsome zoo that already exists and any contribution we can make, we will try to; and we will consider this very deeply.

You have an estimate of our thinking.

DR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We are very grateful and we have made notes and we'll reconsider these matters. I must say, I've been very much convinced by some of the statements that have been made here today, and insofar as economics and other matters make it possible, we will restudy this and with your permission come back again for another presentation.

I do want to say just two things: One, vast numbers of people do come to this zoo. It is one of the most visited zoos in the world, and so one must remember we are

24 September 1963

Dear Doctor Carmichael:

I am writing in regard to the proposed designs for the Connecticut Avenue Entrance and Viewing Terrace, National Zoological Park, which the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed at its meeting on 18 September.

As you know, the members of the Commission were unanimous that they could not approve the plans as presented. They recognized the need to develop and modernize the aging exhibit areas of the Zoological Park when they endorsed the new Master Plan in 1961. The plans as presently developed, however, represent a departure from the Master Plan, and will destroy great sections of the outstanding natural beauty of the park by placing too much emphasis on structural elements at the expense of the exhibits. While not opposed to the idea of a Viewing Terrace, or a new Pedestrian Entrance at Connecticut Avenue, the members recommended that the designs should be restudied to reduce their impact and merge their elements into the landscape, and to preserve existing trees to the greatest extent possible.

The Commission will meet again on 16 October and will be glad to consider revisions if they are ready.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Doctor Leonard Carmichael
Secretary
The Smithsonian Institution
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT F 2